

**McCoy, Erin**

Superfund

DU-DD

**From:** McCoy, Erin  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 22, 2015 9:36 AM  
**To:** Hylton Jackson (Hylton.Jackson@dnr.iowa.gov)  
**Cc:** Nicoski, Dan; Richards, Robert  
**Subject:** Comments on Vogel 2015 Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report

Hylton, per our meeting on Monday, here are the EPA comments on the Vogel 2015 Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report. Let me know if you have any questions. Also, please include cc me when you forward EPA and IDNRs comments to Vogel so I can have a copy of both for our records. Thanks!

### General Comments

Differences in the March/May groundwater analytical results were apparent in several wells and may be due to passive diffusion bag (PDB) placement (vertical variability) rather than concentrations within the well. The introduction needs to list the depth where samples were collected, how long the PDBs were allowed to equilibrate in the well, etc. Also, three of the samples collected in May were from bags placed above the screened interval, which would not allow adequate groundwater flow through for the analysis to be viable and therefore **are likely NOT representative of conditions in the gravelly sand**. Because of the lack of approved quality assurance project plan (QAPP), placement of PDB's above the well screen, and inconsistency between sampling depths between events and PDB/HydraSleeve placement, EPA recommends IDNR reject the March and May analytical results. **Prior to the next sampling event, a QAPP, field sampling plan (FSP), and/or work plan describing how the PDBs and Hydrosleeves will be used to sample needs to be submitted.**

If vertical variability needs to be tested to determine where to place the PDBs, multiple PDBs/HydraSleeves should be installed in the same well during the same sampling event. Also, since the sampling method has been switched, sampling the wells using both the new and old method during the same sampling event would provide comparative data and is highly recommended.

What statistics were used to perform the statistical analysis? Statistical trends need to be performed on analytical data instead of trend lines. Several free programs are available and are used frequently on groundwater data to determine stability.

The contamination is discussed for each well, but not for the site as a whole. There is no discussion of potential seasonal fluctuation, if increases or decreases in concentration are associated with the potentiometric surface, or change in plume size over time. **The discussion of the reports should be more focused on the site a whole instead of individual wells.**

The text notes that recent results indicate additional PDB sampling should be completed prior to determining if remedial action is warranted. **The higher site groundwater concentrations warrant an active remedial action be initiated sooner rather than later. A work plan should be submitted to outline work necessary to select a remedial action. The work plan should include a projected time line with measurable progress targets.**

The proposed use of in-situ remedial technologies parallels the southern property line. Nether of the injection remedial alternative propose treating the source area. Will any attempt be made to treat other portions of the site? Additional wells may be needed to adequately determine COC concentrations entering and leave this treatment zone. Have soil tests such as sieve analysis or bench testing been performed to determine if the soil where injection would likely occur will accept the material or if the injection material will work on the contaminants? The groundwater should also be analyzed for parameters that could potentially inhibit the effectiveness of the selected technology (check with the selected vendor).



Air sparge/soil vapor extraction may be an option to remediate the source area. EPA suggests evaluating this method to determine if it can be used for source treatment.

#### **Specific Comments**

Page 3, Section GMW-33 – There are two reasons for the installation of this well. The way the text is written, the purposes conflict with each other. Update the wording to better outline why the well was installed.

Page 3, Section GMW-7R, Sentence 3 – There is a typo in 'sampling'.

Page 4, Section GMW-19, Sentence 4 – *BTEX MCLs have not been exceeded at this location*. Ethylbenzene exceed the MCL in 2010.

Page 6, Free Product Recovery – Bailing stirs up the free product in the well, limiting the amount of free product that can be removed. EPA recommends using a peristaltic pump to remove the free product more effectively.

Table 1 – Please review the table information for wells GMW-15 through GMW-20. The first one to four events listed are for other wells.

Table 2 – Why are some of the metals samples filtered and some are not?

Table 3 should include the well construction information for well TC-7.

Figure 2, Groundwater Contour Map (Based on the May 2015 static water level elevations)

- Table 1 indicates well TC-7, rather than well GMW-1, with a groundwater elevation of 1277.60 ft; however, the figure shows the elevation on well GMW-1. Re-evaluate contours on northern portion of the site.
- The figure shows a water level reading for well MW-1; however Table 1 does not present one.
- Several wells depicted on the figure in this area are without groundwater elevations. The addition of those elevations may present a clearer flow pattern.
- It is unlikely that the change in groundwater flow direction (nearly 90 degrees) in the area of wells GMW-30/GMW-35 thru 37 is as abrupt as depicted on the figure. Review and revise as appropriate.

Erin McCoy, P.G. | Remedial Project Manager  
EPA Region 7 | Superfund Division | Iowa Nebraska Branch  
11201 Renner Blvd | Lenexa, KS 66219  
Phone: 913.551.7977  
[mccoy.erin@epa.gov](mailto:mccoy.erin@epa.gov) | [www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov)